

REMARKS

Claims 1, 10, and 14 have been amended. Claims 2-6 were previously canceled, and claims 7-9 and 11-13 are canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 10, and 14 remain under consideration.

Claim 1 has been amended to remove recitation of components (B) and (D), and to remove recitation of (C-2) where R3 is an alkyl group having 7 to 29 carbon atoms. Claim 10 has been amended to remove recitation of component (A), and to include the limitations of claims 11 and 12. Claim 14 has been amended for clarity. No new matter has been added.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Baba (WO/02/092735A1). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a lubricant composition that comprises a base oil as well as components (A) and (C). Although the Examiner has pointed out that Baba discloses N-oleyl sarcosinic acid, as well as sarcosines and their derivatives, meeting the limitation of C-1-1. However, the N-oleyl sarcosinic acid (CAS Registry No. 10025-06-6) disclosed by Baba is not the same compound as N-oleoyl sarcosine (CAS

Registry No. 110-25-8) as identified in the present application as C-1-1. Although Baba refers to sarcosine derivatives, Baba does not disclose the compound N-oleoyl sarcosine. Therefore, Baba's mention of sarcosine derivatives and N-oleyl sarcosine does not fairly disclose N-oleoyl sarcosine or meet the limitation of C-1-1 of the present application.

As for (C-2), the case where R3 is an alkyl group having 7 to 29 carbon atoms has been deleted by amendment, and therefore the behenic acid ($C_{22}H_{44}O$) component disclosed by Baba is no longer within the presently claimed invention.

Thus the lubricative composition of claim 1, comprising a base oil as well as components (A) and (C), is not disclosed by Baba. Further, the lubricative composition of claim 10 comprising a base oil, component (C), and at least one additive selected from components (B) and (D), also is not disclosed by Baba, since components (C) and (D) are not disclosed by Baba. Consequently, the rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 102(b) or § 103(a)

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under U.S.C. 103(a) as

obvious over Baba (WO02/092735A1). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 13 has been cancelled, so its rejection is moot.

Regarding claim 14, as argued above, Baba's mention of sarcosine derivatives and N-oleyl sarcosine does not fairly disclose N-oleoyl sarcosine or meet the limitation of (C-1-1) of the present application. Baba also does not teach or suggest component (C-2), as behenic acid no longer falls under the present claim.

Thus Baba does not teach or suggest the composition of claim 14, consisting essentially of a base oil and component (C) (either (C-1) or (C-2)), and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 7-8 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Baba (WO 02/092735A1) in view of Yokota et al. (US 2002/0035043A1). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 7-8 and 11-12 have been cancelled, so the rejection is moot with respect to those claims. As claims 11 and 12 have been incorporated into claim 10, the rejection is discussed below as it might apply to claim 10.

As argued above, Baba does not teach or suggest either component (C-1) or component (C-2). N-oleyl sarcosine and sarcosines and their derivatives do not meet the limitation of C-1-1 since N-oleoyl sarcosine and N-oleyl sarcosine, sarcosines and their derivatives are not identical. Furthermore behenic acid disclosed by Baba is not included in formula (4) of (C-2).

Yokota is cited as teaching the ester oiliness improver of component (D) which is an ester of a polyhydric alcohol and a fatty acid of a monobasic acid. However, since neither Baba nor Yokota provide a teaching or suggestion of either component (c-1) or component (C-2), amended claim 10 is not obvious over Baba in view of Yokota. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/594,290

Filed: May 7, 2007

TC Art Unit: 1797

Confirmation No.: 6319

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney to discuss any matter which would expedite allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

KATSUYA TAKIGAWA ET AL.

Dated: November 16, 2009

By: Charles L. Gagnebin iii/

Charles L. Gagnebin III

Registration No. 25,467

Attorney for Applicant(s)

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN, GAGNEBIN
& LEOVICI LLP

Ten Post Office Square

Boston, MA 02109

Telephone: (617) 542-2290

Telecopier: (617) 451-0313

CLG/LJH/mrb

386151.1